



Corres. and Mail
BOX AF

AF #
3622

S&H Form: (10/03)

REPLY/AMENDMENT FEE TRANSMITTAL	Attorney Docket No.	826.1431	
	Application Number	08/971,903	
	Filing Date	November 17, 1997	
	First Named Inventor	Hiroshi HARUKI	
	Group Art Unit	3622	
AMOUNT ENCLOSED	420.00	Examiner Name	J. Myhre

FEE CALCULATION (fees effective 10/01/03)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number Previously Paid For	Number Extra	Rate	Calculations
TOTAL CLAIMS	19	- 20 =	0	X \$ 18.00 =	\$ 0.00
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	10	- 10 =	0	X \$ 86.00 =	0.00
Since an Official Action set an <u>original</u> due date of <u>December 10, 2003</u> , petition is hereby made for an extension to cover the date this reply is filed for which the requisite fee is enclosed (1 month (\$110); 2 months (\$420); 3 months (\$950); 4 months					420.00
If Notice of Appeal is enclosed, add (\$330.00)					
If Statutory Disclaimer under Rule 20(d) is enclosed, add fee (\$110.00)					
Information Disclosure Statement (Rule 1.17(p)) (\$180.00)					
Total of above Calculations =					\$ 420.00
Reduction by 50% for filing by small entity (37 CFR 1.9, 1.27 & 1.28)					
TOTAL FEES DUE =					\$ 420.00

- (1) If entry (1) is less than entry (2), entry (3) is "0".
(2) If entry (2) is less than 20, change entry (2) to "20".
(4) If entry (4) is less than entry (5), entry (6) is "0".
(5) If entry (5) is less than 3, change entry (5) to "3".

RECEIVED

FEB 18 2004

METHOD OF PAYMENT

- ☒ Check enclosed as payment.
- ☐ Charge "TOTAL FEES DUE" to the Deposit Account No. below.
- ☐ No payment is enclosed and no charges to the Deposit Account are authorized at this time (unless specifically required to obtain a filing date).

GROUP 3600

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

- ☒ If the above-noted "AMOUNT ENCLOSED" is not correct, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any additional fees necessary to:
- Deposit Account No. **19-3935**
- Deposit Account Name **STAAS & HALSEY LLP**
- ☒ The Commissioner is also authorized to credit any overpayments or charge any additional fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 (filing fees) or 37 CFR 1.17 (processing fees) during the prosecution of this application, including any related application(s) claiming benefit hereof pursuant to 35 USC § 120 (e.g., continuations/divisionals/CIPs under 37 CFR 1.53(b) and/or continuations/divisionals/CPAs under 37 CFR 1.53(d)) to maintain pendency hereof or of any such related application.

SUBMITTED BY: STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Typed Name	Richard A. Gollhofer	Reg. No.	31,106
Signature	<i>Richard A. Gollhofer</i>	Date	2/10/04



RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 3622

Docket No. 826.1431

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Hiroshi HARUKI, et al.

Serial No. 08/971,903

Group Art Unit: 3622

Confirmation No. 4920

Filed: November 17, 1997

Examiner: J. Myhre

For: COMPUTER-RELATED PRODUCT USER MANAGEMENT AND SERVICE SYSTEM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attention: **BOX AF**

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed September 10, 2003, having a period for response set to expire on December 10, 2003. A Petition for a two-month extension of time, together with the requisite fee, is submitted herewith, making the period for response end on February 10, 2004.

In the September 10, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-8 and 10-20 were pending, and rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,867,714 to Todd et al. Claims 1-8 and 10-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

RECEIVED

FEB 1 8 2004

GROUP 3600

00000393 08971903

420.00 SP

012

As discussed during the Examiner Interview on February 9, 2004, Todd et al. does not teach or suggest that "user registration information ... is **transmitted from the user to a different vendor** other than the software product's vendor, that sells products that may be of interest to users of the particular software product" (e.g., claim 1, last five lines, emphasis added). All of the communication disclosed in Todd et al. occurs between a user's computer and the remote data source.

Furthermore, it is submitted that Todd et al. contains no suggestion of even supplying information to the user from other vendors. As discussed during the February 9, 2004 Examiner Interview, no support has been found for the assertion in paragraph 5b of the Office Action that Todd et al. stores a "registration database [that] contains ... information ... from the user during ... [a] registration process" (Office Action, page 6, lines 14-15). In support for this statement, column 12, lines 21-29 and 58-65 of Todd et al. were cited. The first portion of column 12 does not refer to the registration database and instead discusses the "AT&T Tourguide Tutorial". It should be noted that from 1991 to the end of 1996 the assignee of Todd et al., NCR Corporation, was a division of AT&T (in fact it was named "AT&T Global Information Solutions" from 1994 to 1996 when the Todd et al. application was filed, see, <http://www.ncr.com/history/history.htm>) and thus, the discussion of the "AT&T Tourguide Tutorial" in the first portion of column 21 does not appear to be a reference to a product from "a different vendor other than the software product's vendor", but rather a product from the company that maintains the registration database. Thus, if a secondary reference is combined with Todd et al., some motivation to combine the references will have to be found outside of the teachings of Todd et al.

In addition to the claim limitations discussed at the February 9, 2004 Examiner Interview, please note that no teaching or suggestion has been found in Todd et al. of "requesting an external unit for new information about the computer-related product which corresponds to the requested information type from a computer-related product vendor and information on additional products available from a plurality of vendors that can be used with the product" (e.g., claim 12, lines 5-8). After registration, Todd et al. only states that the user's computer "transmits current configuration data to the remote data source" (column 14, lines 4-5) and then, "the remote data source 130 analyzes the current configuration data" (column 14, lines 15-16), "identifies a conflict, ... selects software revisions ... as a function of the identified conflicts" (column 14, lines 18-20) and "transmits the software revisions to the computer system" (column 14, lines 21-22). Several other claims recite limitations regarding information requests from the user. Therefore, it is submitted that these claims further patentably distinguish over Todd et al.

SUMMARY

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that Todd et al. does not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-8 and 10-20 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Request for Reconsideration, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY/LLP

Date: 2/10/04

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501